

Using Quadruple Lenses to probe the Structure of the Lensing Galaxy

Hans J. Witt

Astrophysikalisches Institut Potsdam, An der Sternwarte 16, 14482 Potsdam, Germany

ABSTRACT

We show here that quadruple lenses can be useful laboratories to probe whether the potential of the lensing galaxy is purely elliptical or whether an additional distortion is present in the deflector plane. For this test we only have to know the relative image positions of the quadruple lens system and the (relative) center of light position of the lensing galaxy.

Furthermore we introduce new methods which easily allow us to determine the location (rotation angle relative to the image positions) of the major axis of the lensing galaxy. In due course we can determine the parity of the four images as well. We apply these methods to the 8 currently known quadruple lenses and find that in the case of MG 0414+0534, CLASS 1608+656 and HST 12531–2914 it is impossible to accommodate the relative image positions and the galaxy position with any elliptical potential whereas the other five cases can be described very well with a simple elliptical potential. This method will have important impacts for χ^2 -fits and the reconstruction of galaxy models for quadruple lenses.

Subject headings: galaxies: structure – gravitational lensing – quasars: individual(MG 0414+0534, CLASS 1608+656, HST 12531–2914)

1. INTRODUCTION

Quadruple lenses are very special configurations where a quasar is located behind the center of a lensing galaxy. Only such an arrangement can plausibly reproduce such image configurations. Currently there are already eight quadruple lenses known in the optical band (see Keeton & Kochanek 1996 and references therein, hereafter referred to as KK96).

For most of the quadruple lenses the image configuration can be reconstructed by using a simple galaxy model, e.g. an elliptical potential or a circular potential plus shear (see e.g.

Kochanek 1991, Wambsganss & Paczyński 1994, Witt, Mao & Schechter 1995). However, in the case of MG0414+0534 it seemed rather difficult to find an adequate model which has a small number of free parameters and a χ^2 which is close to one per degree of freedom (cf. Falco et al. 1996). I show in this *letter* that for the reconstruction of some quadruple lenses an elliptical potential or a circular potential plus external shear can not provide a satisfactory solution independent on the number of free parameters for the χ^2 -fit.

2. PROPERTIES OF ELLIPTICAL POTENTIAL

A very commonly used potential for galaxy models in the gravitational lensing literature is either an elliptical potential like the (elliptical) power-law potential (see e.g. Kassiola & Kovner 1993 and references therein) or just a circular potential plus an external shear (see e.g. Kochanek 1991, Wambsganss & Paczyński 1994). I show here that both potential have remarkable properties concerning the possible position of the lensing galaxy.

We assume a given two-dimensional elliptical potential in the deflector plane in the form $\psi(x^2 + y^2/q^2)$ where q ($0 < q \leq 1$) is the axis ratio of the elliptical potential. The (projected) surface mass distribution is then given by $\Delta\psi = 2\kappa(x, y)$, where $\kappa(x, y) = \Sigma(x, y)/\Sigma_{\text{crit}}$ is expressed in units of the critical density Σ_{crit} which depends on the distances to the deflector and the source (cf. Schneider, Ehlers & Falco 1992). The two-dimensional deflection angle is then simply given by the derivatives of the potential, $\alpha = \nabla\psi$.

Considering now the two dimensional lens equation in normalized coordinates, we can write

$$\xi = x + \gamma x - \frac{\partial\psi((x - x_G)^2 + (y - y_G)^2/q^2)}{\partial x} = x + \gamma x - \frac{\partial\psi(r_e)}{\partial r_e} 2(x - x_G) \quad (1)$$

$$\eta = y - \gamma y - \frac{\partial\psi((x - x_G)^2 + (y - y_G)^2/q^2)}{\partial y} = y - \gamma y - \frac{\partial\psi(r_e)}{\partial r_e} \frac{2(y - y_G)}{q^2} \quad (2)$$

where (x_G, y_G) is the position of the center of the lensing galaxy, γ is the shear which is supposed to act along the x -axis (major axis, $\gamma > 0$) or along the y -axis (minor axis, $\gamma < 0$) and $r_e = (x - x_G)^2 + (y - y_G)^2/q^2$. (Note that a purely elliptical potential ($\gamma = 0$) and a circular potential plus shear ($q = 1$) are contained as special cases in the equations).

Through this paper we are choosing a special coordinate system where the source is at the origin ($\xi = \eta = 0$). Now we can move each of the the last term of eqs.(1) and (2) on the left side of the equations and divide eq.(2) by eq.(1). Assuming the potential yields at least 4 images (as observed for the case of quadruple lenses) we find the following relation for the

image positions in this particular coordinate system:

$$\frac{y_i(1 - \gamma)}{x_i(1 + \gamma)} = q^{-2} \frac{(y_i - y_G)}{(x_i - x_G)} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, 4, \dots \quad (3)$$

Combining these four equations, we can now first eliminate q and γ and then further x_G by assuming that we know the image positions (for this particular coordinate system). Eliminating first q and γ we obtain

$$x_G y_G [x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1] + x_2 y_2 [x_G y_1 - x_1 y_G] + x_1 y_1 [x_2 y_G - x_G y_2] = 0 \quad . \quad (4)$$

where the index 1 or 2 may be replaced by an index of $i = 3, 4, 5$, respectively.

Further elimination of x_G yields that y_G factorizes automatically out of the equation by this process. In other words x_G can not be determined independently with the third image position. The final relation for 3 image positions is given by

$$x_3 y_3 [x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1] + x_2 y_2 [x_3 y_1 - x_1 y_3] + x_1 y_1 [x_2 y_3 - x_3 y_2] = 0 \quad (5)$$

which has the same structure as eq.(4). In this relation each index may be replaced by the index of another image, i.e. by the index of the fourth or fifth image. The problem is that usually only the relative image positions are observed (the first image is placed at the origin) and the position of the source is unknown. However, we can relate the relative image positions with this particular coordinate system. The two coordinate systems are related by a shift in the x and y -direction and by a rotation of an angle θ . We note that eq.(4) and eq.(5) are a function of the form $y_i = a_1 x_i / (1 + a_2 x_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4, G$, whereby a_1 and a_2 are coefficients which are determined by two other image positions. If we transform now this kind of equation into a coordinate system with relative image positions (shifted and rotated coordinates which are denoted with a prime) we obtain the following equation ($x'_1 = y'_1 = 0$):

$$c_1 x'^2 + c_2 x' y' - c_1 y'^2 + c_3 x' + y' = 0 \quad (6)$$

This equation is the main result of the paper. It is the general equation which yields the possible position of the lensing galaxy and the image positions assuming an elliptical potential plus shear as given in the lens equations (1) and (2). The coefficients c_1 , c_2 and c_3 are uniquely determined by the three relative image positions of the quadruple lens (x'_i, y'_i) for $i = 2, 3, 4$ (or by two relative image positions and one relative galaxy position) and can be obtained by using for example Cramer's rule. Equation (6) is almost comparable with an equation of a hyperbola, but here we have an additional mixed term $x' y'$. We emphasize here that a possible central fifth image (or any additional image) must be located on this curve as well. Also the (relative) source position is located on this curve assuming the lens equation as given in eq.(1) and (2). We shall keep this in mind for the discussion below. In Figure 1 two examples of quadruple lenses are shown where the line of eq.(6) is indicated.

3. The Major Axis of the Lensing Galaxy

As a corollary we can now determine the rotation angle of the major axis of the elliptical potential (or the direction of the shear for $q = 1$, see §2) relative to the right ascension ($\Delta\alpha$) and declination offset ($\Delta\delta$) of the (relative) image positions. If we rotate eq.(4) by an angle θ , this would yield the general form of eq.(6). Taking this into account we obtain

$$\tan(2\theta) = -2\frac{c_1}{c_2} = \frac{2 \sum_{i=2}^4 x'_i y'_i [x'_{[i+1]} y'_{[i+2]} - x'_{[i+2]} y'_{[i+1]}]}{\sum_{i=2}^4 (x_i'^2 - y_i'^2) [x'_{[i+1]} y'_{[i+2]} - x'_{[i+2]} y'_{[i+1]}]} \quad (7)$$

where the square brackets at the index are defined as $[5] = 2$, $[6] = 3$ and $[i] = i$ else. This equation contains the 3 relative image positions (which can be observed in the case of quadruple lenses). Therefore we can determine the rotation angle θ of the major axis of the lensing galaxy relative to the observed image positions of a quadruple lens. However, this relation does not give us a unique angle. It only gives us the rotation angle modulo 90° . Therefore we have still two choices, how the major axis can be located (i.e. rotated). To obtain an unique solution we need further information about the parity of the images. We now show a way how the parity of the images can be determined and hence how to uniquely determine the rotation angle, if the flux ratios of the images are known.

3.1. Parity of the Images

For the case that the center of the galaxy is very close to the line of sight ($x_G \ll 1'', y_G \ll 1''$) we expect that the images of negative parity are located close (“parallel”) to the major axis of the lensing galaxy and that the images of positive parity are located further away (“perpendicular”) to the major axis of the lensing galaxy (cf. Fig. 1). This must be the case because the critical curves have elliptical form with the same alignment of the major axis. Since the images of a quadruple lens are almost located on a circle (Einstein ring) the two images along the major axis must be located inside the critical curve at the region of negative parity. Without any proof we state here that inside the region where the maximum number of n images may appear

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i \mu_i \geq 1 \quad (8)$$

does hold. p_i denotes the parity of the images ($p_i = +1$ or -1) and μ_i is the magnification of the images. This relation is well motivated because it can be shown that for every (elliptical) power-law galaxy as studied by Evans (1994) this relation is true (Witt 1996, in

preparation). Especially if the mass of the deflector is more centrally concentrated the left side of the relation is close to one and for flatter mass distribution the relation on the left side becomes larger. Dividing eq.(8) by the magnification of one of the images yields that the sum of the flux ratios times the parity must be always positive. If the flux ratios are observed we can uniquely determine the rotation angle θ by testing relation (8) providing that the flux ratios are not heavily influenced by microlensing. This is certainly not the case in the radio band where the source size is too large to obtain significant variations caused by microlensing (cf. the discussion in Witt et al. 1995).

In the case that two bright images are close together like in PG 1115+080 and MG 0414+0534 (see KK96) we can use the relation (8) to determine the parity immediately. Since the two bright images have opposite parity and almost equal brightness they must cancel each other in the sum of eq.(8). The third brightest image must have positive parity and consequently the fourth more fainter image must have negative parity to assure that the sum is positive in eq.(8). The four images of the lens form always almost a circle whereby the parity should alternate along the circle. This determines the parity of the two bright images. We note that a possible central fifth image must have positive parity.

4. DISCUSSION

We showed here that for any elliptical potential or any circular potential plus external shear that produce four images the image positions and the position of the lensing galaxy are related. They must be located on certain lines which are determined by eq.(6) (cf. also Figure 1). In addition it is shown that the rotation angle of the major axis can be determined from the relative image positions of a quadruple lens. In Table 1 we present the rotation angle θ and the minimum discrepancy $\Delta_{\min}$ (in arcsec) of the observed galaxy position to the curve of eq.(6) for the 8 currently known quadruple lenses. In three cases, i.e. for MG 0414+0534, CLASS 1608+656 and HST 12531–2914, we find that the discrepancy $\Delta_{\min}$ is much larger ($> 3\sigma$) than the claimed measurement error of the galaxy position. For these cases it is impossible to achieve a good χ^2 -fit by using an elliptical potential and to try to accommodate the galaxy and the image positions simultaneously.

We would like to emphasize here that the lines as shown in Fig. 1 are a unique property of the elliptical potential. As far as we know they do not exist for other potential. Only in the case of elliptical potential (circular potential plus shear) we find lines in the parameter space which gives the possible location of the galaxy while in other cases we find isolated discrete points in the parameter space which yields us the position of the galaxy. As an example we can start with an potential in the form $\psi(x^4 + y^4/q^4)$. Such an potential would

be boxier than an elliptical potential. Doing the steps as described in §2 we end up with an equation in the form $f(\{x'_i, y'_i, i = 2, 3, 4, G\}, \theta) = 0$. In this case the galaxy position does not simply factorize out of the equation. The consequence is that we need for this case three relative image positions plus the relative galaxy position to determine the rotation angle θ . But for this case we are able to determine the relative position of the source and q , as well. Surprisingly we found one or more (discrete) solutions for each quadruple lens in Table 1 (except for H 1413+117 where the galaxy position has not been observed). This means we can not exclude automatically a potential in the form $\psi(x^4 + y^4/q^4)$ for any known quadruple lens. The situation is very different for elliptical potential. The relative source position is located somewhere on the line as indicated in Fig. 1. Thus we are not able to determine q from the image positions or galaxy position when we use an elliptical potential.

The consequences are very severe when we choose an elliptical potential to use it for a χ^2 -fit of a quadruple lens. If we use only the relative image and galaxy position for the χ^2 -fit of an elliptical potential (or circular potential plus shear) we find that the χ^2 (nearly) degenerates in q (γ). Consequently we find models with higher magnification for q closer to one (or for smaller γ), but the χ^2 -fit does not show significant differences. This phenomenon is confirmed by our numerical calculation using an elliptical power-law potential by Evans (1994), (cf. also Wambsganss & Paczyński 1994 for a circular potential plus shear).

The recommendations are as follows: If only the relative image and galaxy positions of a quadruple lens are known an elliptical potential or a circular potential plus shear should not be used for the χ^2 -fit because it tends to degenerate. (This is also true for elliptical mass distribution if $0 \ll q < 1$. In this case elliptical mass distribution behave similar like elliptical potential). In this case it is better to use for example more boxier potentials or potentials which deviate considerably from elliptical potential. If the flux ratios are known in addition, an elliptical potential may be used for the χ^2 -fit when (a) the galaxy position is close to the line of eq.(6) and when (b) the flux ratios are incorporated appropriately in the χ^2 -fit. If we add an external shear (γ_1, γ_2) to an elliptical potential (which acts not along the major axis) we obtain a whole set of possible solutions (γ_1, γ_2) for the external shear which is able to accommodate the 3 relative image position and the relative galaxy position, as well. In this case we need the flux ratios in addition to determine the two components of the external shear.

More exact determination of the relative image positions, the relative galaxy positions and the flux ratios is needed to discriminate an elliptical potential or another potential for the observed quadruple lenses. This is especially the case for 2237+0305 where the discrepancy of the galaxy position is very close to the 3σ -level (cf. Table 1). In addition

this method can help to narrow considerably the effort to search for the possible location of the lensing galaxy (especially for the case of H 1413+117) and a possible central fifth image. Further this test might be useful to resolve the confusing situation of 2016+112 (see e.g. Garrett et al. 1994 and KK96) and it can be tested whether 2016+112 consist out of two, three or eventually more images and it can be tested where the lensing galaxy might be located.

I am grateful to Emilio Falco and Joseph Lehar for encouragement and discussion and I like to thank Joachim Wambsganss for comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by a postdoctoral grant of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) under Gz. Mu 1020/3-1.

TABLE 1

Currently Known Quadruple Lenses

Object	$\theta[^\circ]$	$\Delta_{\min}['']$	$\sigma_{\text{galaxy}}['']$	Reference
2237+0305	−23.2	0.014	0.005	Crane et al. 1991
PG 1115+080	−24.2	0.062	0.05	Kristian et al. 1993
MG 0414+0534	−8.9	0.144	0.03	Ellithorpe 1995, Schechter & Moore 1993
CLASS 1608+656	−21.5	0.129	0.01	Myers et al. 1995, Schechter 1995
B 1422+231	36.1	0.032	0.05	Patnaik et al. 1992, Yee & Ellingson 1994
H 1413+117	21.8*	—	—	Schechter 1995, Kayser et al. 1990
HST 14176+5226	−41.0	0.068	0.03	Ratnatunga et al. 1995, 1996
HST 12531−2914	18.6*	0.224	0.03	Ratnatunga et al. 1995, 1996

Note.— θ is the rotation angle of the major axis of the lensing galaxy relative to the observed image position (cf. Figure 1) and $\Delta_{\min}$ is the minimum distance (in arcsec) of the observed galaxy position to the curve of eq.(6), (cf. solid line in Figure1). σ_{galaxy} denotes the claimed measurement error of the relative position of the lensing galaxy (see reference). The asterisk denotes the cases where θ could not be determined unambiguously because of different observed flux ratios in different colors (cf. §3). For H1413+117 no galaxy position was identified yet.

REFERENCES

- Crane, P. et al. 1991, ApJ, 369, L59
 Ellithorpe, 1995, Ph.D. thesis, MIT, see KK96, p. 429
 Evans, N.W. 1994, MNRAS, 267, 333
 Falco, E.E., Lehár, J., Shapiro, I.I., & Kristian, J. 1996, ApJ, submitted
 Garrett, M.A. et al. 1994, MNRAS, 269, 902
 Kassiola, A. & Kovner, I. 1993, ApJ, 417, 450

- Kayser, R., et al. 1990, ApJ, 364, 15
- Keeton II, C.R. & Kochanek, C.S. 1996, in Kochanek, C.S. & Hewitt, J.N. (eds.), IAU 173, Melbourne, *Astrophys. Applications of Gravitational Lensing*, Kluwer, p. 419 (KK96)
- Kochanek, C.S. 1991, ApJ, 373, 354
- Kristian, J. et al. 1993, AJ, 106, 1330
- Myers, S.T. et al. 1995, ApJ, 447, L5
- Patnaik, A.R. et al. 1992, MNRAS, 259, 1p
- Ratnatunga, K.U., et al. 1995, ApJ, 453, L5
- Ratnatunga, K.U., et al. 1996, in Kochanek, C.S. & Hewitt, J.N. (eds.), IAU 173, Melbourne, *Astrophys. Applications of Gravitational Lensing*, Kluwer, p. 323
- Schechter, P.L. 1995, private communication in KK96
- Schechter, P.L. & Moore, C.B. 1993, AJ, 105, 1
- Schneider, P., Ehlers, J., & Falco, E. E. 1992, *Gravitational Lenses* (Springer-Verlag: New York)
- Wambsganss, J. & Paczyński, B. 1994, AJ, 108, 1156
- Witt, H.J., Mao, S., & Schechter, P.L. 1995, ApJ, 443, 18
- Yee, H.K.C., & Ellingson, E. 1994, AJ, 107, 28

Fig. 1.— Relative image and galaxy positions are shown for two observed quadruple lenses (for references see Table 1). The solid line indicates the region where the source position, the position of the galaxy and the position of the central image may be located as obtained by eq.(6) (see text). The dashed line indicates the location of the major axis of the lensing galaxy as obtained by eq.(7). Note that the images close to the dashed line have negative parity (see §3.1).